

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 16-27, 29, and 31-41 are now pending in the application. Claims 40 and 41 have been added as new. Claims 4, 12, 15, 28, and 30 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have cancelled the features from the claims that the Examiner has objected to as not being shown in the drawings. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to the drawings.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-12, 33, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that the drive unit and controller are in “electrical communication.” This is supported by the specification at paragraph [0025], stating that “[t]he control unit 30 communicates with the drive unit 32 by a cable 34.” Claims 40 and 41 have been added as new, depending from claims 1 and 25, respectively. Claims 40 and 41 state that the fluid flow from the supply unit is the same fluid as passes through the control housing to provide cooling, indicating that the cooling

fluid of claims 1 and 25 may be different from the fluid flow from the supply unit. Additionally, as indicated above, references to first, second, and third cooling fluids have been removed. As such, all §112 rejections are believed to have been overcome. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12, 33, 34, and 35 are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1-3, 8, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Khelifa et al. (U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2004/0000161, hereinafter "Khelifa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-3, 8, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Helt et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,720,981, hereinafter "Helt"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 25-27, 32 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wlech (U.S. Pat. No. 6,370,903, hereinafter "Wlech") in view of Helt. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 1 and 25 have been amended to include substantially all of the limitations of claims 4 and 28, previously objected to. Applicants therefore believe these claims to now be in condition for allowance, as discussed below.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 13-24 are allowed. The Examiner states that claims 4-7 and 33-35 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner further states that claims 28-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 25 to include the limitations of claims 4 and 28, respectively. Therefore, claims 1 and 25 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, 5-11, and 40 depend from claim 1 and claims 26, 27, 29, 31-39, and 41 depend from claim 25 and should therefore be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-11, 25-27, 29, and 31-41 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 8, 2006

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey
Reg. No. 38,543

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Cary W. Brooks, Esq.
General Motors Corporation
Legal Staff - Mail Code 482-C23-B21
PO Box 300 - 300 Renaissance Center
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000
Ph: 313-665-4717
Fax: 313-665-4976

RWM/JMP/slg